

STATE OF ILLINOIS
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

COMMONWEALTH
COMPANY

EDISON

Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity, pursuant to Section 8-406.1 of the Illinois Public Utilities Act, and an Order pursuant to Section 8-503 of the Illinois Public Utilities Act, to Construct, Operate, and maintain a new 345 kilovolt transmission line in Ogle, DeKalb, Kane and DuPage Counties, Illinois

Docket 13-0657
(On Rehearing)

DIRECT TESTIMONY OF ELLEN ROBERTS VOGEL

1 **Q: Can you please provide your name and address?**

2 A: My name is Ellen Roberts Vogel. I live at 55 Hamilton Avenue, Elgin,
3 Illinois 60123.

4 **Q: What is your interest in this proceeding, particularly on rehearing?**

5 A: I have an interest in property located in Plato Township, with an address
6 of 42W165 Rohrsen Road, Plato Center, Illinois 60124. The property is
7 approximately 240 acres and lies on both the north and south sides of the CN
8 Railroad, and is situated between Muirhead Springs Forest Preserve and Plato
9 Center. It is shown on ComEd Ex. 35.01, sponsored by Mr. Naumann on
10 rehearing, located almost in the middle of that map. I am including with my
11 testimony an aerial view of my property with boundaries shown, as Vogel Ex. 2.1.

12 **Q: Did you previously provide testimony in this proceeding?**

13 A: I submitted prepared written testimony labeled as Vogel Exhibit 1.0, filed
14 on April 7, 2014. In that testimony, I responded to the testimony of Monica
15 Meyers concerning a possible realignment of the route of ComEd's proposed
16 transmission line through the Muirhead Springs Forest Preserve. As I testified
17 then, Ms. Meyers did not describe where the line would be routed east of
18 Muirhead Springs.

19 **Q: Why are you providing this testimony?**

20 A: I oppose the FPDKC Adjustment, proposed by the small group of
21 landowners who have interests in property near where I own property. I also
22 oppose what has been called the ComEd Conditional Rehearing Alternative
23 Route, as described by ComEd witness Steven Naumann in ComEd Ex. 35.0.

24 **Q: Please describe your property in more detail, including when and**
25 **how it was acquired, and how the land is used.**

26 A: The property was acquired around 1850 by my great grandfather William
27 Muirhead. The property was passed onto my father William Roberts and will be
28 passed on to his children Anne Roberts, John Roberts, and Ellen Roberts Vogel.

29 **Q: Please describe the residence and other structures and**
30 **improvements on the property.**

31 A: The land is used for farming and income. The residence is a two story
32 home (historic, built in the 1850's) and is currently used as rental income
33 property. In the future the home will be used by a family member. In addition to
34 the home there are also nine buildings and eight silos. We have recently been
35 remodeling the home and have made significant investments into planting new
36 trees. We are also currently investing into repairs of the other buildings.

37 **Q: Who lives in the residence?**

38 A: Currently the residence is being remodeled for either a family member or
39 rental income.

40 **Q: How is title to the property held?**

41 A: The property is currently held in trust for William H Roberts with Ellen
42 Roberts Vogel and Anne Roberts as co-trustees. Ellen Roberts Vogel, Anne
43 Roberts, and John Roberts are the future beneficiaries.

44 **Q: Please describe the location of the residence and other structures in**
45 **relation to the CN Railroad.**

46 A: The distance between the CN Railroad and the nearest farm building is

47 300 feet and the distance between the residence is 700 feet.

48 **Q: What has been the effect, if any, of the railroad's proximity to your**
49 **property and residence?**

50 A: The railroad tracks are on elevated land and bisect the property. There is
51 one hazardous crossing on the property which is the one and only access point
52 to the land on the south side of the railroad tracks. The railroad has made it
53 somewhat more difficult to farm the property.

54 **Q: What is your understanding of the location of the transmission line**
55 **under either the FPDCK Adjustment or the ComEd Conditional Rehearing**
56 **Alternative Route?**

57 A: Based on my understanding of where the centerline would be located, it
58 would run approximately 800 feet from the closest point of the residence; and it
59 would run approximately 400 feet from the nearest non-residential structure.
60 These distances do not include any outward span of the line from the centerline
61 which would reduce these distances.

62 **Q: How would you describe the difference in impact on you and your**
63 **property between the existing R.R. and ComEd's proposed transmission**
64 **line?**

65 A: This would further reduce the amount of tillable acres and make the land
66 around the line more difficult to farm. It would also greatly reduce the future
67 value of the land for potential residential use. There are also health and safety
68 issues as well as aesthetic issues. The relatively tall transmission towers would
69 be a significant intrusion upon our property, located as close as it would be.

70 **Q: What other negative factors exist with respect to the KCFPD**
71 **Adjustment?**

72 A: The power line would run close to numerous homes, a youth baseball
73 park, a fire station, town hall and a day-care center. Also, routing power lines
74 through a forest preserve is not consistent with the mission of maintaining open
75 space, protecting wildlife habitats, wet lands and prairies.

76 **Q: Do you believe there is a more reasonable manner to route the**
77 **proposed transmission line?**

78 A: Yes. The transmission line should be routed using the route that ComEd
79 presented as its Primary Route, and which the ICC approved in its Order. That
80 route consists of more open farmland that can better accommodate the
81 transmission line, as well as any future lines that ComEd may plan and build. I
82 also believe that it is unfair for the other landowners to have remained essentially
83 silent during the original proceedings, when they could have participated by
84 submitting testimony in support of their position but did not. Now, I have to spend
85 additional money and time as a result of that group coming in after the ICC
86 entered its order and requesting another chance to challenge the route which
87 was approved. The group of which I was a part (SKP Group) could have utilized
88 our expert, Mr. Dauphinais, while he was engaged, to provide his expert views
89 as to the proposed routing adjustment.

90 **Q: Does this conclude your testimony?**

91 A: Yes.